

Applicant : Viraj Chatterjee, et al.
Serial No. : 10/680,930
Filed : October 7, 2003
Page : 2 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-613001 / P566

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending, with claims 1, 18, 35, 46 and 48 being independent.

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 18-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 18, 35-37 and 46-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Arakeri et al. (US 6,601,129). Claims 2-7, 19-24 and 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arakeri in view of Tafoya et al. (US 5,917,480). Claims 8-17 and 25-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arakeri in view of Tafoya et al and further in view of Meyn et al. (US 5,859,623). Claims 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arakeri in view of Meyn. Claims 44 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arakeri and in view of Meyn et al. These contentions are respectfully traversed.

Examiner Nguyen is thanked for the interview, which was conducted with Applicants' representative, Mr. Hunter, on February 28, 2007. During the interview, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and the Arakeri reference were discussed. Agreement was reached that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 should be withdrawn. In addition, agreement was reached that the Arakeri reference is not relevant art for the pending claims and the rejections based on the Arakeri reference should be withdrawn. Thus, in view of the telephone interview, withdrawal of the above listed rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102 and 103, is respectfully requested.

Applicant : Viraj Chatterjee, et al.
Serial No. : 10/680,930
Filed : October 7, 2003
Page : 3 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-613001 / P566

Claims 48-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Meyn et al. This contention is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 48 recites, “software-application-means for outputting multiple, simultaneous, independent views of the electronic document to different display hardware devices having different screen resolutions and color depths.” (Emphasis added.) Meyn conveys graphic information to the projectors by means of a field programmable gate array 56 and a graphics controller 58, among other hardware components. (See Meyn at col. 5, lines 31-53.) Meyn does not describe software-application-means for outputting multiple, simultaneous, independent views of an electronic document to different display hardware devices having different screen resolutions and color depths, as described and claimed in the present application. Thus, for at least this reason, the rejection of claims 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the Applicants believe that Claims 1-49 are in condition for allowance and ask that these pending claims be allowed. The foregoing comments made with respect to the positions taken by the Examiner are not to be construed as acquiescence with other positions of the Examiner that have not been explicitly contested. Accordingly, the arguments for patentability of a claim should not be construed as implying that there are not other valid reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims.


Applicant : Viraj Chatterjee, et al.
Serial No. : 10/680,930
Filed : October 7, 2003
Page : 4 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-613001 / P566

Please apply any necessary charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2007



William E. Hunter
Reg. No. 47,671

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 21876
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10691237.doc